



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CHLORONYMS

BY JOHN HENDLEY BARNHART

Under the caption "An unwritten law of nomenclature," in a recent issue of his *Leaflets of botanical observation and criticism*,* Professor Greene has protested strongly against what he is pleased to call "the newly introduced usage of naming two or three different genera of plants in honor — dishonor, it should be said — of one and the same man, and doing it deliberately." We may safely disregard Professor Greene's provision that the act be committed deliberately, for it is hazardous to attempt the interpretation of unexpressed motives underlying publication, and he shows by his further remarks that when two or more names have been dedicated to the same person he regards the first name only as valid, even if the duplication were unintentional.

Now one might suppose, at first sight, that Professor Greene's protest was actually aimed against the flood of names like *Neowashingtonia*, *Englerella*, *Stapfiola*, *Philippiamra*, *Saccardophytum*, *Faxonanthus*, *Brittonastrum*, *Pringleochloa*, and *Greeneocharis*, so much in evidence during recent years. It must be admitted that names of this class represent a "newly introduced usage," a distinctly modern invention of questionable value ; and if Professor Greene had protested against these verbal monstrosities upon purely linguistic grounds (as the first part of his discussion would lead us to expect) doubtless he would have found some sympathizers. But he does not object to these names upon the ground of their form, for he expressly states that he considers *Brittonamra* valid, and he has himself proposed the name *Neobeckia*, which remains valid as far as his present criticisms are concerned.

Instead of the usage of dedicating two or more genera to one and the same man being "newly introduced," it has been known for more than a hundred years, and the only reason why cases of the kind are not more numerous in the earlier literature is that there were so few persons (mostly Frenchmen) whose names lent themselves readily to such a practice ; the modern *neo-ella-astrum-anthus* method of multiplying names being at that time unknown.

* I: 201. 10 Ap 1906.

The most astonishing statement in Professor Greene's paper is that the earliest case known to him of the deliberate naming of a second genus for one man was in 1850, when Kunth proposed *Wittia* for the later of the two genera previously named *Clintonia*. Further than this, and as if to emphasize it, he says that while there may be earlier cases, he thinks not. This assertion, if permitted to go unchallenged, coming as it does from a botanist who is reputed to possess an unusual degree of familiarity with the history of botanical names, would naturally be accepted as authoritative by the casual reader.

A precisely similar case, however, occurred twenty-five years earlier. *Esenbeckia* H.B.K. (1825) and *Esenbeckia* Blume (1825) were dedicated independently to the brothers Nees von Esenbeck. Blume, discovering that his name was a homonym, changed it to *Neesia* (1828); thus *Esenbeckia* H.B.K. and *Neesia* Blume have come down to us side by side until the present day, both of them universally recognized as valid genera. *Neesia*, however, according to the newly discovered unwritten law, is not valid; it is surely not a "homonym" of *Esenbeckia*, and as the discoverer of this law has not given us any word by which to characterize such a name, perhaps we may be permitted to call it a "chloronym." This word is so appropriate that it would be superfluous to explain its derivation. It happens that *Neesia* Blume (1828), besides being a chloronym of *Esenbeckia* H.B.K. (1825), is a homonym of *Neesia* Spreng. (1818); and *Esenbeckia* H.B.K. (1825) is also a chloronym of this earlier *Neesia*; and finally, this first *Neesia* being a synonym of an earlier name, by this bit of jugglery both of the time-honored names *Neesia* and *Esenbeckia* disappear from view forever!

A few other chloronyms, earlier than the one cited by Professor Greene as the first, may be mentioned here, the names of the genera being preceded by the names of the persons to whom they were dedicated.

1. RENÉ LOUCHE DESFONTAINES. *Louichea* L'Her. 1789. — *Fontanesia* Labill. 1791. — *Desfontainea* R. & P. 1794. (It may be worth mentioning that this last name was altered to *Linkia* by Persoon, in 1805, because of *Fontanesia*, but this emendation was rejected by nearly all of his contemporaries.)

2. JEAN BAPTISTE MONET DE LAMARCK. *Monetia* L'Her. 1784. — *Markea* Rich. 1792. — *Lamarkia* Moench, 1794.
3. NAPOLEON BONAPARTE. *Bonapartea* R. & P. 1802. — *Napoleona* Beauv. 1807.
4. AUBERT AUBERT DU PETIT-THOUARS. *Aubertia* Bory, 1804. — *Thuarea* Pers. 1805.
5. JULES DUMONT D'URVILLE. *Urvillea* H.B.K. 1821. — *Durvillaea* Bory, 1826.
6. CONSTANTINE SAMUEL RAFINESQUE-SCHMALTZ. *Schmaltzia* Desv. 1813. — *Rafinesquia* Nutt. 1841 (and several earlier genera "*Rafinesquia* Raf.").

Now it is not to be supposed that this exhausts the list, but most of the names here mentioned have received practically universal recognition, and are to be found, accepted without question, in such works as those of DeCandolle, of Bentham & Hooker, and of Engler & Prantl. Some of the above-mentioned chloronyms, in fact, if deprived of their validity under this "unwritten law," leave their respective genera nameless; such are *Desfontainea* (*Linkia* Pers. being a homonym of *Linkia* Cav.), *Napoleona* and *Durvillaea*. Surely it is Professor Greene's solemn duty to propose tenable names for these genera.

Modern chloronyms, as everyone realizes, are very abundant, and in practically every case they are without available synonyms; it is to be hoped, of course, that Professor Greene will increase the burden of synonymy (for that is all it is likely to amount to) by furnishing names wholly unexceptionable in form and derivation. For instance, twenty years ago there was no genus dedicated to Professor Adolf Engler, of Berlin; now, besides the first, *Engleria* O. Hoffm. (1889), there are the following chloronyms, awaiting substitutes from which Engler's name has been eliminated: *Englerella* Pierre (1891), *Englerophoenix* Kuntze (1891), *Englerastrum* Briquet (1894), *Englerodaphne* Gilg (1894), and *Englerina* Van Tieghem (1895). Surely there is a broad field opening for Professor Greene's activities.

After all, one of the greatest difficulties attending the application of the "unwritten law" lies in the fact that derivation, not form, must be the factor determining whether a given name is

a true chloronym or not. For instance, *Parryella* A. Gray (1868), named for Dr. C. C. Parry, is not a chloronym of *Parrya* R. Br. (1824), named for Capt. W. E. Parry; and *Pringleophytum* A. Gray (1885), named for Mr. C. G. Pringle, is not a chloronym of *Pringlea* Anders. (1845), named for Sir John Pringle. As there is no law compelling an author who proposes a new generic name to give the derivation of that name, it is often a matter of mere guess-work whether two names which might be of the same derivation are actually so. Perhaps Professor Greene has some means of determining facts like these.

PLEISTOCENE PLANTS FROM VIRGINIA

BY EDWARD W. BERRY

The investigation of American Pleistocene floras stands in striking contrast to the splendid results of European research, due mainly to more intensive methods of collecting and study there pursued. Aside from the work of Penhallow and a few scattered papers by Lesquereux, Knowlton and others, practically nothing has been done in this country. While leaf-impressions may not be common in the Pleistocene clays, careful search of swamp deposits by a sort of placer-mining process is almost sure to yield an interesting collection of seeds many of which are readily identifiable.

The material upon which the following notes are based consisted of a small quantity, perhaps a pound in all, of hard lignite collected by Dr. B. L. Miller, of Bryn Mawr College, and deposited in the collections of the Johns Hopkins University. It was collected at Tappahannock on the Rappahannock River, Virginia, and is from the Talbot formation, the latest Pleistocene formation recognized.

FAGUS AMERICANA Sweet.

Fagus ferruginea Michx. Lesq. Am. Jour. Sci. **27**: 363. 1859.
Geol. Tenn. 427. *pl. K. f. 11*. 1869.—Knowlton, Am. Geol.
18: 371. 1896.

Nuts indistinguishable from those of the American beech are occasionally present. They are somewhat distorted, although